



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,849	10/30/2003	Andrew Doddington	14846-30	9764
28221	7590	07/19/2010	EXAMINER	
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC 65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE ROSELAND, NJ 07068			OYEBISI, OJO O	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	3695			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/19/2010	PAPER			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/697,849	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DODDINGTON, ANDREW
	<b>Examiner</b> OJO O. OYEBISI	<b>Art Unit</b> 3695

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2010.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-9,11-14,16,17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

In the amendment filed on 05/03/2010, the following have occurred: claims 1, 14 and 20 have been amended and claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are currently pending.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu et al (US PAT: 6347307) in view of Reed (US Pat: 6,757,710), and further in view of Eugene et al (Eugene hereinafter, EP 0597316 A2).

**Re claim 1.** Sandhu discloses a computer-implemented method for modeling a financial product, comprising the steps of: displaying on a first visual display a palette of objects

for constructing a financial product (see fig.17 element 1250, see fig.18 element 1350, see col.48 lines 50-67); displaying on the first visual display at least one window for graphically representing the financial product in the form of a tree that includes a hierarchy of entities wherein each entity includes one or more attributes (i.e., typically financial objects will be stored on the user's internal system as Java objects, which are in the form of object graphs. Such object graphs consist of inter-linked nodes representing the elements and the attributes of the financial object, see col.48 lines 56-62, see fig.3-6, also see col.49 lines 20-60); and selecting objects from the palette to construct the financial product (i.e., In some embodiments of this invention, XML object mappings 1410 may be customized by the user, in order to correspond to the form and structure of the user's proprietary financial objects, see col.48 lines 65-66, also see col.49 lines 23-60). Sandhu does not explicitly disclose wherein selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window. and wherein at least one of the entities is a Watcher entity, configured to monitor at least one or more attributes and output a message in response to a change in the at least one of the one or more attributes. However, Reed discloses selecting the objects from the palette includes dragging the objects from the palette to the window (i.e., The resulting icon 1542 would then be ready for use. The user could then add other communications **object** system users to this discussion, such as Mary 5146 and Trent 5147, by **dragging** their icons from the user **palette** 5131 and dropping them on top of the discussion group icon 5126, see col.143 lines 50-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sandhu and Reed

to allow a pointing device to be used to select one or more screen objects for action by a program command. Reed does not explicitly disclose wherein at least one of the entities is a Watcher entity, configured to monitor at least one or more attributes and output a message in response to a change in the at least one of the one or more attributes. Eugene discloses wherein at least one of the entities is a Watcher entity (i.e., ANYEVENT trigger reaction rule, see pg 9 lines 55-58) configured to monitor at least one or more attributes and output a message in response to a change in the at least one of the one or more attributes (see pg 9 lines 55-58). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Sandhu, Reed and Eugene to detect and log stray events.

**Re claim 3.** Sandhu further discloses the method wherein the tree structure corresponds to an XML document (i.e., FinXML trade element structure, see fig.3, also see fig.7 elements 1100, 1110, 1120, also see col.37 lines 40-60).

**Re claim 4.** Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein an XML schema defines a valid structure for the XML document (i.e., FinXML events element structure, see fig.6)

**Re claim 7.** Sandhu further discloses the method, further including displaying the attributes of an entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 8.** Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein displaying the attributes of an entity includes displaying an attribute name and corresponding attribute values (see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 9.** Sandhu further discloses the method, further including editing an entity using a data entry form (see col.48 lines 50-67)

**Re claim 11.** Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein the watcher entity generates an output message when triggered (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 12.** Sandhu further discloses the method, wherein the Watcher entity is a Logging Watcher entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 13.** Sandhu further discloses the method of claim 11, wherein the Watcher entity is an Action Watcher entity (see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 14.** Claim 14 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale as in claim 1 supra.

**Re claim 16.** Sandhu further discloses the system wherein the tree structure corresponds to an XML document (i.e., FinXML trade element structure, see fig.3, also see fig.7 elements 1100, 1110, 1120, also see col.37 lines 40-60).

**Re claim 17.** Sandhu further discloses the system, wherein an XML schema defines a valid structure for the XML document (i.e., FinXML events element structure, see fig.6)

**Re claim 19.** Sandhu further discloses the system, wherein the tree structure includes a hierarchy of entities, each of the entities having at least one attribute name and a corresponding attribute value(see col.48 lines 57-60, also see col.49 lines 20-33).

**Re claim 20.** Claim 20 recites similar limitations to claim 1 and thus rejected using the same art and rationale as in claim 1 supra.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 05/03/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues in substance that the prior arts of record fail to disclose wherein at least one of the entities is a Watcher entity configured to monitor at least one or more attributes and output a message in response to a change in the at least one of the one or more attributes. Contrary to the applicant's assertion, Eugene discloses an ANYEVENT reaction rule configured to detect and log stray events. The examiner contends that an ANYEVENT reaction rule, as taught by Eugene, reads on applicant's claimed limitations of a Watcher entity configured to monitor at least one or more attributes and output a message in response to a change in the at least one of the one or more attributes.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OJO O. OYEBISI whose telephone number is (571)272-8298. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A.M-5:30P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Kyle can be reached on (571)272-8594. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/OJO O OYEBISI/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3695

Application/Control Number: 10/697,849  
Art Unit: 3695

Page 8